DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 309 845 PS 018 142

TITLE New Partnerships: Education's Stake in the Family Support Act of 1988.

INSTITUTION American Public Welfare Association, Washington, D.C.; Center for the Study of Social Policy, Washington, DC.; Children's Defense Fund, Washington, D.C.; Council of Chief State School Officers, Washington, D.C.; Grant (W.T.) Foundation, New York, N.Y.

PUB DATE 89
NOTE 32p.
AVAILABLE FROM WTG, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Suite 301, Washington, DC 20036-5541 ($1.00).
PUB TYPE Guides - Non-Classroom Use (055) -- Legal/Legislative/Regulatory Materials (090)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adult Basic Education; *Agency Cooperation; Comprehensive Programs; Educational Change; *Educational Responsibility; Family Involvement; Federal Government; *Federal Legislation; Government Role; High Risk Students; Local Government; *Low Income Groups; *Poverty; Resource Materials; School Business Relationship; State Government; *Welfare Services
IDENTIFIERS Aid to Families with Dependent Children; *Family Support Act 1988

ABSTRACT

The Family Support Act of 1988 (FSA) provides a means by which federal, state, and local governments can work systematically and comprehensively to provide the support people need to escape poverty. The act mandates that appropriate educational services be made available to at least some welfare recipients as part of the effort to help those receiving public assistance become self-supporting. The document: (1) highlights aspects of the FSA that are relevant to both the education and the public welfare communities; (2) describes the opportunities that FSA offers for both systems to meet their own and shared goals for populations at risk; (3) emphasizes the importance and benefits of collaboration between education and the human services in the implementation of FSA; and (4) offers suggestions that may abet the implementation process. Appended are a summary of the major provisions of the FSA, an overview of the Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) program, resources for additional information and assistance, and a reference list. (RH)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED309845

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

# NEW PARTNERSHIPS

## *Education's Stake in the Family Support Act of 1988*

PS 018142

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Samuel Halperin
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE



A STATEMENT OF

American Public Welfare Association
Center for Law and Social Policy
Center for the Study of Social Policy
Children's Defense Fund
Council of Chief State School Officers
Institute for Educational Leadership
National Alliance of Business
National Association of State Boards of Education
National Governors' Association

**Copies of this statement are available by mail or in person from WTG, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Suite 301, Washington, DC 20036-5541 for a handling charge of $1.00 each, postpaid.**

# NEW PARTNERSHIPS: EDUCATION'S STAKE IN THE FAMILY SUPPORT ACT OF 1988

## Contents


4 Introduction

6 Overview of the Family Support Act

10 Helping People Succeed: Strategies for Success

11 How Welfare and Education Systems Are Organized: Different Roles for Federal, State, and Local Government

12 The Family Support Act: Opportunities to Address Common Concerns

- To forge critical connections between school and support services
- To expand the range and capacity of educational programs for learners at risk
- To make the right match between people, their needs, and the programs designed to help them
- To reduce the future number of at-risk learners by developing innovative and more effective early intervention and prevention approaches
- To begin to build a more comprehensive and effective system for *all* youth and adults at risk.

12 Successful Educational Programs for Young People At Risk

14 Successful Educational Programs for Adults At Risk

18 Principles to Guide Joint Action

18 Next Steps

20 An Illustration: FSA in the Life of One Family

23 Appendix A: Summary of the Major Provisions of the Family Support Act

27 Appendix B: An Overview of AFDC-The Aid to Families with Dependent Children Program

28 Appendix C: Resources for Additional Information and Assistance

30 Appendix D: For Further Reading

# INTRODUCTION

**"Educational activities under JOBS could eventually improve the education and employment skills of millions of today's welfare recipients and help them to escape poverty and achieve economic self-sufficiency."**

With the passage of Public Law 100-485, The Family Support Act of 1988 (FSA), federal, state, and local governments prepare to take a major step on the long road toward reform of the public welfare system. More than a simple effort to reduce costs and caseloads, this new legislation seeks to strengthen families and help them move toward self-sufficiency. The contributions of many partners – education, employment training, health, public welfare and others – will be needed to achieve these far-reaching goals.

Key among the partnerships that must be formed is one between the welfare community and education, for FSA clearly recognizes education as a central element in helping families avoid long-term dependence on public assistance. In a marked departure from earlier welfare-to-work programs, FSA requires states to make educational services available to participants under its new Job Opportunities and Basic Skills Training Program (JOBS) and provides federal matching funds to assist in these efforts. Depending upon the level of state investment, educational activities under JOBS could eventually improve the education and employment skills of millions of today's welfare recipients and help them to escape poverty and achieve economic self-sufficiency.

Enactment of the Family Support Act comes at a time when education and the human services are under increasing fire. Business demands for a better prepared workforce and the taxpayers' need to reduce the escalating human costs and fiscal burden of welfare dependency converge on both these people-serving systems. As each has struggled separately to find more effective ways of helping children and families at risk, it has become increasingly clear that the problems to be tackled reach beyond the purview of any one system. Poverty and its effects pose barriers to classroom success; poor academic achievement limits job opportunities and the chance for financial independence. Clearly, helping welfare recipients gain the skills they need requires the very best efforts of the education and human service sectors working together.

Collaborative efforts can help each of these systems deal more effectively with some of their most vexing problems. Public schools need partners to provide the non-academic supports that will keep high-risk students, like teen parents, in school and encourage dropouts to return. Welfare agencies need allies to ensure that their clients have the education and employment training necessary to survive in the labor market. In recent years, both education and welfare administrators have recognized these mutual concerns and have sought greater collaboration between their respective sectors. As a result, a number of creative and important partnerships have already been forged.

Now, the Family Support Act, which must be implemented by October 1, 1990, offers a chance to build on this promising beginning. It provides an avenue through which each sector can systematically contribute to a comprehensive effort that incorporates the range of supports people need to escape poverty. Acknowledging that poor basic skills, language difficulties, and inadequate educational attainment can pose virtually impenetrable barriers to self-sufficiency, the *Family Support Act mandates that appropriate educational services be made available to at least some welfare recipients as part of efforts to help those receiving public assistance to become self-supporting*. In large measure, the success of FSA will depend on the willingness of state legislatures to provide matching funds for essential services, and the quality of communication among educators and human service providers. Both systems will benefit if they understand the mutual advantages and opportunities inherent in the Act's implicit call for innovative, cooperative mechanisms.

The organizations which have worked together to author this statement **(American**

**Public Welfare Association, Center for Law and Social Policy, Center for the Study of Social Policy, Children's Defense Fund, Council of Chief State School Officers, Institute for Educational Leadership, National Alliance of Business, National Association of State Boards of Education,** and **National Governors' Association,** with the support of the **Ford Foundation,** the **Foundation for Child Development,** and **Youth and America's Future: The William T. Grant Foundation Commission on Work, Family and Citizenship)** represent policymakers, policy analysts, administrators, and welfare advocates. Convinced that the education provisions of the Family Support Act offer an important means to address common concerns, we urge cooperation among our constituencies at the state and local levels in order to help the greatest number of families become truly independent. To aid in this collaboration, the following pages:

- highlight the aspects of the Family Support Act (FSA) that are relevant to both the education and the public welfare communities. For many educators, this may serve as an introduction to the FSA. Welfare administrators are already familiar with the law, of course, but may find it useful to have a summary of those provisions that must be addressed jointly with their colleagues in education;
- describe the opportunities that FSA offers for both systems to meet their own and shared goals for populations at risk: to forge critical connections between school and support services; to expand the range and capacity of educational programs for learners at risk; to make the right match between people, their needs, and the programs designed to help them; to reduce the future number of at-risk learners by creating innovative and more effective early intervention and prevention approaches, and to begin to build a more comprehensive and effective system for *all* youth and adults at risk; and
- emphasize the importance and benefits of collaboration among education and the human services in implementing FSA, and offer suggestions that may aid in that process.

We hope that this information will assist educators and welfare administrators as they come together to explore their respective goals, air differences, assess resources, and plan strategies for producing a stronger citizenry and a more productive workforce.

**"Convinced that the education provisions of the Family Support Act offer an important means to address common concerns, we urge cooperation among our constituencies at the state and local levels in order to help the greatest number of families become truly independent."**

# OVERVIEW OF THE FAMILY SUPPORT ACT

**"All the provisions of the Family Support Act . . . are based on the conviction that parents have an obligation to support their children."**

The Family Support Act shifts the emphasis of Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC), the nation's primary welfare program, from simply providing income support to building strong families and helping them become truly self-sufficient. FSA is based on the belief that mutual obligations exist between society and its citizens. Parents have a basic obligation to support themselves and their children. If they cannot, they have an obligation to prepare themselves for and to seek employment. Government, in turn, has an obligation to provide financial support and assistance through education, training, support services, and employment-related activities to those who need special help.

The new FSA law recognizes that the needs of welfare families vary. Many welfare recipients are on public assistance for only a short time and then become permanently self-supporting. Others move on and off public assistance, often within a year or two, as their life circumstances change. But welfare use is not short-term for everyone. A substantial subgroup remains poor for a very long time, frequently a decade or more. Although relatively small, this group receives a disproportionate share of resources, in large part because they lack the basic educational preparation to participate competitively in today's job market. The Family Support Act places particular emphasis on these latter individuals and on removing the barriers to their financial independence.

### What are the major program components of the Family Support Act?

*Child Support Enforcement*

All the provisions of the Family Support Act, including those with special significance for educators, are based on the conviction that parents have an obligation to support their children. The law underscores this view by strengthening procedures for assuring that child support is paid by absent parents. A state agency, usually located in the welfare department, currently attempts to collect child support for all children receiving public assistance, and will help anyone else who pays a small fee. FSA will buttress these efforts by requiring that courts use numerical formulas in setting support amounts and by requiring the use of wage-withholding to collect child support in most cases.

*Comprehensive Education, Training, and Employment-Related Services*

The Job Opportunities and Basic Skills Training Program (JOBS) consolidates and replaces existing welfare/work provisions. For the first time, federal law *mandates that educational services must be available to participants in welfare-to-work programs.*

At a minimum, *educational services* must include high school or studies leading to an equivalency diploma (GED), remedial education to achieve a basic literacy level, and education for individuals with limited English proficiency. States may also choose to offer additional educational services, including college or other postsecondary education or training. *Employment-related services* must include job skills training, job-readiness activities, and job placement and may include a variety of other activities. In some cases, welfare agencies may encourage private sector employers to hire recipients by providing a salary subsidy in the initial months of employment.

Within federal guidelines, each state will decide which education and employment services it will provide, how they will be provided and to whom, the resources that will be devoted to various activities, and whether the services will be available statewide or only in certain areas. States will also specify the criteria for referral to education and training, and the intensity of services that will be offered to individual welfare recipients and their families. These decisions will reflect choices

and necessary tradeoffs – for example, will resources be stretched to provide at least some service to as many people as possible, or will fewer individuals receive more intensive services? Is the primary goal reducing welfare rolls by moving people as quickly as possible into jobs that may offer little future, or can time be taken to enhance long-term employability by increasing skills?

States will be required to *assess the educational, child care, and other supportive service needs of each JOBS participant.* An *individualized employability plan* based on this assessment will list the specific activities in which the recipient will participate and the services to be provided, including education programs, child care, and other support services. The participant may be required to negotiate and enter into a contract specifying both the participant's and the agency's obligations. In addition, a *case manager* may be assigned to the participant and participant's family to obtain or broker services for the family, to monitor progress, and to review the employability plan with the participant. The employability plan would be used as a guide to review the participant's progress toward education goals.

*Child Care*

The law specifies that states must guarantee *child care* not only for JOBS participants, but for every AFDC parent who is satisfactorily participating in an approved education, training, or employment activity, even if the program itself is not funded through JOBS. New federal resources will be provided for this purpose. Child care can be provided through contracts or vouchers to purchase care, by cash reimbursement, or in child care programs administered directly by social service agencies, schools, or alternative education programs.

*Transitional Services*

The law also recognizes the importance of easing the transition from welfare to employment, since many entry-level jobs do not offer benefits. Under FSA, individuals who leave public assistance for employment may qualify for *transitional benefits*, including up to 12 months of subsidized child care and health care coverage, if their income is still low and they meet certain other requirements.

*Assistance for Two-Parent Families*

FSA provides that states that have previously denied AFDC *benefits to unemployed, two-parent families* must begin to provide assistance to these families for at least six months in each year.

### Who will participate in the JOBS program?

Most healthy adult and adolescent parents receiving welfare can be allowed or required to participate if child care is available. What is expected in terms of participation will depend on an individual's degree of job readiness and her/his career goals.

It is unlikely that everyone potentially subject to JOBS requirements will be included right away. Within certain parameters, the federal law permits a state to phase in the JOBS program and to tailor program designs and requirements to fit the needs of recipients and the services available in various parts of the state.

Although states are provided considerable discretion in determining whom to serve first, the law stipulates that a state may receive its full share of federal funding *only* if at least 55 percent of JOBS funds are expended on four target groups considered especially at risk:

- parents under age 24 who have not completed and are not enrolled in high school or its equivalent;
- parents under age 24 who have little or no work experience;
- individuals who have received public assistance for at least 36 of the last 60 months; and
- members of a family who will lose AFDC eligibility within two years because the youngest child, by virtue of age, will no longer qualify as a "dependent child."

FSA provides that, within target groups, those who volunteer must be served first.

### Who will receive educational services?

With few exceptions, *some form of education must be offered to any JOBS participant who lacks a high school diploma or equivalent.* Under that broad umbrella, the Act specifically cites several groups whose past educational experience and/or current circumstances suggest that they will need special help:

"The law specifies that states must guarantee child care not only for JOBS participants, but for every AFDC parent who is satisfactorily participating in an approved education, training, or employment activity. . . . New federal resources will be provided for this purpose."

- adolescent parents of school age;
- young parents just beyond traditional school age, ages 18 and 19, who have not completed high school or its equivalent; and
- parents over age 20 who lack a high school diploma, to the extent they are required under the state plan to participate in the JOBS program.

In addition, states may choose to offer special services to those who have a diploma or GED but who still lack the basic literacy skills needed for employment. States may also choose to offer postsecondary education as a JOBS option.

**"Young AFDC parents often face the bleakest job prospects .... The typical AFDC mother between the ages of 17 and 21 has reading skills below the sixth grade level."**

**How many participants are likely to need educational services?**

Accurate state-by-state data do not exist. However, several sources suggest that substantial numbers of AFDC recipients will need remedial education in order to meet the entry requirements for a training program or a job with a future. According to the Children's Defense Fund, three-fifths of all adults on AFDC have not completed high school. Estimates by Robert Lerman of Brandeis University based on the most current U.S. Census Bureau data show that roughly half of all AFDC recipients age 16 or older were high school dropouts in March 1988. By comparison, one-quarter of all non-recipients in the same age group were dropouts in that month.

Even with a diploma or equivalency certificate, however, some individuals may still lack needed employment skills. California's state-initiated welfare, education, training, and employment program found that almost 60 percent of participating adults required some form of remedial education before they could be considered job-ready. In a separate study, the Educational Testing Service found that the majority of adults subject to AFDC work requirements in 1983 had reading and math skills below the eighth or ninth grade level, less than the proficiency required by many entry-level jobs. Young AFDC parents often face the bleakest job prospects. Analyses of data from the National Longitudinal Survey of Young Americans by Andrew Sum of Northeastern University indicate that the typical AFDC mother between the ages of 17 and 21 has reading skills below the sixth grade level.

FSA provides a good opportunity for states to compile accurate information on the educational status of recipients in order to design and implement effective services. The Act allows each state to conduct a demographic study to determine the educational and employability needs of its AFDC population and the availability of programs to address those needs. The federal government will pay 50 percent of the cost of those studies completed by October 13, 1989.

**Are educational services available for children whose parents are in JOBS?**

Although FSA does not mandate services other than child care for dependent children in AFDC households, states may elect to address the educational needs of this group as well. Both the education and welfare systems have reason to welcome this opportunity. Research indicates that children in poverty are more likely to drop out of school than their more affluent peers. Those who experience school failure increase the risk of continuing to need public assistance, an outcome that the Family Support Act seeks to avoid.

Children receiving AFDC constitute over half of the school population in some urban areas. In Milwaukee County, Wisconsin, for example, officials estimate that almost 60 percent of elementary and secondary school students receive such aid. Since, according to the U.S. Department of Education, students in schools with a high concentration of low-income students tend to do less well, whether or not they themselves are poor, than students in schools with more balanced populations, targeted efforts to assist youngsters from AFDC households – together with broad-based school reform efforts – could have a major impact on the education system's ability to realize the overall gains in school performance that the nation demands.

**When will the JOBS program be implemented?**

FSA requires all states to implement the JOBS program by October 1, 1990, but they may begin operations as early as July 1, 1989. Planning may proceed on the basis of proposed regulations published by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services

(HHS) on April 18, 1989. Following a 60-day period for public comment, final regulations will be published by October 13, 1989.

Preliminary activity is already underway in some states and is likely to begin rapidly in others. Some jurisdictions which are currently developing or operating their own state-initiated welfare, education, training, and employment programs have had a head start. Others are moving quickly to take advantage of the increased federal support offered under JOBS.

**What new federal revenues are available and how will they be spent?**

The Family Support Act commits the federal government for the first time to the provision of increasing levels of funding for education, training, and employment programs for AFDC recipients, as well as for the support services necessary to enable recipients to participate in these activities. There are two new sources of revenue under the Act – one for JOBS and the other for child care.

*JOBS funding* will be provided to states as a capped entitlement that is available up to an established maximum. The extent to which JOBS funding is available for educational activities will depend on the priority given to those activities in each state's JOBS design, as well as on decisions about target populations and program entry and exit criteria.
The federal authorization for Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 1989 is capped at $600 million. However, since the program will not begin operations until the last quarter of FFY 1989, $150 million in funds will be available. Funding is authorized to increase to $800 million in FFY 1990, $1 billion in FFY 1991, 1992, and 1993; $1.1 billion in FFY 1994; $1.3 billion in FFY 1995; and $1 billion in FFY 1996 and subsequent years.

Each state's maximum JOBS allocation will be based on a formula reflecting, in part, its share of the adult AFDC population. To obtain federal JOBS money, a state will be required to provide matching funds of approximately 40 percent. The ability of states to do so will vary. Some are already contributing a level of funding to state-initiated efforts that exceeds the required match, and these states should easily secure their full federal allocation. Other states may not have sufficient state revenue for the match, and consequently may have to rely more heavily on existing funding sources, like the Job Training Partnership Act, to carry out JOBS mandates. Early and continuing welfare agency collaboration with education and employment training systems will be needed to assess the full range of resources that are actually available and to determine how they can be packaged to provide the greatest returns for participants.

States must observe a *maintenance of effort* requirement. FSA stipulates that federal funds for educational activities under JOBS may not be used to supplant state and local outlays for existing services and activities, even though they promote the purpose of the JOBS program, nor for activities which are routinely provided on a non-reimbursable basis, e.g., free public school K-12 classroom instruction.

*FSA child care funds*, unlike JOBS revenues, are "open-ended." This means that federal funds will be provided for child care for AFDC recipients participating in JOBS or another approved education, training, or employment program at a matching amount that would vary from 50 to 80 percent among the states.

The recipient of both sources of FSA revenue will be the state AFDC agency, which may expend the dollars directly or contract for services from other agencies or providers, including schools or postsecondary institutions.

**Who is responsible for implementing FSA?**

FSA places primary administrative responsibility with the state agency responsible for managing the Aid to Families with Dependent Children program and allows that agency to arrange for state or local education agencies, Job Training Partnership Act agencies, or other public or private organizations to provide JOBS activities and services.

In addition, at both the federal and state level, the AFDC agency is required to consult with the education agency. This mandate, together with the leadership of the Governor, is intended to promote the coordination of JOBS planning and programming with other education and training programs in the state. The mandate also points to the importance of providing comprehensive services to meet the multiple needs of AFDC recipients trying to bolster their future employability.

**"The Family Support Act commits the federal government for the first time to the provision of increasing levels of funding for education, training, and employment programs for AFDC recipients, as well as for the support services necessary to enable recipients to participate in these activities."**

# HELPING PEOPLE SUCCEED: STRATEGIES FOR SUCCESS

**"Comprehensive services have been shown to be key in helping many individuals overcome barriers to academic achievement and financial independence. Single solutions and one-shot treatments cannot resolve the multiple problems that most long-term welfare recipients face."**

*Comprehensive services* have been shown to be key in helping many individuals overcome barriers to academic achievement and financial independence. Single solutions and one-shot treatments cannot resolve the multiple problems that most long-term welfare recipients face. It generally takes a range of services – educational opportunities to increase basic skills; training and on-the-job experience to enhance employability; and support services, including child care, individual and family counseling, housing assistance, health care, transportation, and transitional income and benefits – to enable individuals to benefit fully from available opportunities.

Not everyone will need or want every service, but if a broad menu of education, family, and job-related supports is available, the most effective mix for each individual can be selected. This underscores another characteristic of successful efforts – they offer *individualized and flexible* services. Rather than adhering to uniform rules that might direct a person to an inappropriate program, or exclude her/him from a necessary one, they attempt to respond to each person's unique circumstances.

The relationships between staff and clients in successful efforts tend to be characterized by *mutual trust and obligation, respect, close contact,* and *cooperation*. These programs also put a high premium on working collaboratively with other agencies and institutions; they look for allies as well as new resources in welfare, education, health, social services, and employment agencies, and in voluntary, religious, civic, and business organizations. Often, a staff person in one organization will serve in a case management or coordinating role with the family to identify and secure services from multiple providers.

Finally, effective interventions to aid individuals and families with multiple needs are *sustained* over a relatively long period, often as much as a year or more. The staff of programs that "make a difference" understand that the problems of many families on welfare, particularly those given priority by the Family Support Act, did not arise overnight and, therefore, they do not expect solutions to be quick or simple. Program policies and evaluations are based on the recognition that, while no "silver bullet" exists, long-term efforts pay off in long-term gains.

The Family Support Act offers opportunities to create programs or combinations of programs that possess these essential ingredients of success. FSA's ultimate achievements, however, will depend on the extent to which states – balancing the tradeoffs necessary because of resource constraints and existing institutional environments – use the lessons of research and experience as starting points to design their own best programs.

# How Welfare and Education Systems Are Organized: Different Roles for Federal, State, and Local Government

Collaboration among sectors will be an important element in taking advantage of the opportunities FSA offers. Effective collaborations are based on mutual understanding. To make their partnerships work, education and welfare administrators will need to appreciate the significantly different ways in which their respective systems are structured.

In the welfare system, primary responsibility rests at the federal and state levels. Federal laws and regulations largely govern program design, although the Family Support Act allows state discretion in some areas, notably the specific elements of the JOBS program.

States are the chief administrative authority for welfare programs. Local welfare offices are either offices of the state agency or county offices operating state-supervised programs. Except for benefit levels in some states, there is virtually no local variation in the Aid to Families with Dependent Children program. Under FSA, this will still be true with respect to major rules like eligibility. However, local JOBS programs may vary across a state, to accommodate differences in economic conditions and the availability of services. Local welfare agency officials will be responsible to work with their education counterparts to design a suitable JOBS program.

In contrast to the organization of the welfare system, elementary and secondary education is largely state- and locally-controlled. Federal government involvement is generally limited to efforts that are designed to assure equal educational opportunity for all students through, for example, supplemental funding for disadvantaged students (Chapter 1 of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act), the Education for All Handicapped Children Act, and the Bilingual Education Act. The states, through appointed or elected boards (except for Wisconsin) and state education agencies, set and administer broad governing policies in matters of attendance, instruction, teacher certification, and graduation requirements. In addition, state education agencies provide a wide range of technical assistance services, such as curriculum and staff development; implement accountability systems to ensure the appropriate expenditure of state and federal funds; and prescribe systems for collecting and reporting educational data for the evaluation and assessment of educational progress in the state.

Local school boards make specific policies for local school systems, and superintendents administer the schools under those policies. Local school districts offer adult education programs and may have alternative schools. The boundaries of a local school system, or district, are rarely coterminous with county lines, so a given local welfare agency may need to deal with multiple school districts.

With respect to JOBS, the "education community" of interest to welfare agencies also includes community colleges, vocational and technical area schools and institutes, four-year colleges, non-profit and for-profit providers of education and training services, and community-based organizations. These function on a highly diverse, independent basis. The local Private Industry Councils which oversee the federal Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) can be helpful in identifying the available resources for education and training in their area of service.

**"Effective collaborations are based on mutual understanding. To make their partnerships work, education and welfare administrators will need to appreciate the significantly different ways in which their respective systems are structured."**

# THE FAMILY SUPPORT ACT: OPPORTUNITIES TO ADDRESS COMMON CONCERNS

Both education and welfare are grappling with how to help those at risk and are seeking ways to overcome barriers which limit chances for success. Schools want to assure not only that a greater proportion of students graduate, but that students who graduate meet a higher standard of achievement than previously. Welfare agencies want to assure that people are prepared for and move into jobs that offer the prospect of long-term financial independence. Through the collaborative efforts that will be encouraged, the Family Support Act offers important opportunities for both systems to deal more effectively with these related concerns. Joint action can support attainment of each system's unique goals and, at the same time, help to meet objectives they have in common.

### OPPORTUNITY #1

**To forge critical connections between school and support services.**

More than academic assistance is necessary for many students to succeed in school. This is particularly critical in the case of adolescent parents, for whom child care, transportation assistance, and help in coping with their various responsibilities can be the keys to staying in school or resuming their education. Older, out-of-school young people and adults

## SUCCESSFUL EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS FOR YOUNG PEOPLE AT RISK

Implementation of the Family Support Act will require a commitment to provide access to regular and alternative schools for AFDC recipients under age 21 who do not have a high school degree or its equivalent. That, in effect, means developing and following an individual education plan for each FSA student. It will also mean providing appropriate programs and services so that these students graduate from high school, earn their GED, or enter postsecondary education or training programs. If they are to become productive citizens and effective parents, these students must master a wide range of basic, conceptual, occupational, and independent living skills.

What will this mean for schools? At the local school district level, programs should exist in regular and alternative schools that are flexible and attuned to the needs and circumstances of participants. Such programs should have clear goals and strategies, be appropriately designed for the needs of school-age young people at risk, including school-age parents, and have qualified staff. Family and health education services and support should be integral components of a school's comprehensive response to AFDC recipients who stay in or return to school.

For the young custodial parent, usually female, barriers to participation in an educational program must be minimized. Assessment sites should be conveniently placed, non-intimidating places, filled with caring and knowledgeable role models and professionals who can properly assess the student's needs and establish a foundation for shared goal-setting and planning. The staff should have good working relations with their counterparts in other agencies, so that services for clients are easily obtained. To the extent that the range of services identified in a plan are readily accessible in one or a few sites, rather than at many dispersed locations, they are more likely to be used.

The plan should also coordinate support services, such as transporta-

with limited skills and complex problems also are likely to need a broad array of supports and services to deal with housing, health, financial, or other concerns, so that they can succeed in education and training programs.

Recognizing the impact of non-school circumstances, many teachers and administrators are concerned that reform efforts to "restructure" the schools by changing certain school practices will not be enough, in themselves, to improve the academic performance of a substantial number of students. In a recent Institute for Educational Leadership survey of urban schools, for example, teachers preferred additional staff to help students with social and personal problems over use of the same resources to reduce classroom size. But to date, schools and other educational providers generally have not reached far beyond their usual scope of instructional responsibility. Now, the FSA offers new opportunities for education and human services – whose responsibilities complement one another – to plan and work together so that the full range of an individual's needs can be met without any single institution having to take a broader role than is appropriate or feasible.

FSA will make necessary social and other support services available to adolescent and adult parents participating in JOBS-related educational activities. In addition, if resources permit, special support services can also be provided in instances where dependent children may be at risk of developing major school problems or of dropping out altogether.

The law is flexible about who actually provides these services and permits schools and welfare agencies to determine the best referral and delivery arrangements for their particular community and client needs.

### OPPORTUNITY #2

**To expand the range and capacity of educational programs for learners at risk.**

The Family Support Act creates an opportunity and a strong incentive for states to augment and expand existing programs for learners at risk and to design new educational

**"The Family Support Act creates an opportunity and a strong incentive for states to augment and expand existing programs for learners at risk and to design new educational strategies which include AFDC recipients among those served."**

tion and child care for young parents attending a regular or alternative high school. Child care provided at, or near, the school site is preferable to child care arrangements involving complicated transportation for both parent and child. On-site child care arrangements have been shown to be particularly successful mechanisms for keeping parenting teens in school, while offering them additional opportunities for parenting, health, nutrition, and homemaking training. Having parents on site also offers opportunities for supervised infant stimulation activities – activities that are essential to the development of young children who are at risk of developmental delays by virtue of their parents' youth, inexperience, and poverty.

Problems of providing sufficient facilities, space, and programs in which curricula and staffing ratios are developmentally appropriate for infants and toddlers can limit the availability of on-site child care. Successful on-site child care exists where there has been careful planning and coordination among education, health, human services, and appropriate licensing agencies.

In addition to day care, other on-site services for at-risk students are needed, including health care programs; programs which remediate skills deficiencies, provide enrichment, and build self-esteem; and counseling for occupational and personal concerns. Counseling loads at regular high schools are often too high to provide the type of support and information that at-risk students need. The level of staff resources should be sufficient to provide social and health services, as well as to meet the academic and occupational training needs of AFDC clients. Mechanisms should also be established to help monitor student progress, resolve problems, and respond quickly to changing student needs.

Above all, schools must seek to engage FSA-supported participants in all aspects of school life, while addressing the special needs of these students and their right to a quality education. Poor school performance and lack of interest often predate parenting and dropping out of school. Successful efforts to reclaim these students must include programs to remediate poor basic skills, provide challenging curricula, and accelerate students to competitive performance levels. Such programs should use flexible and creative instructional approaches, frequently assess student performance, and monitor student progress toward specific instructional goals.

strategies which include AFDC recipients among those served.

Many of those in the groups targeted by FSA are at-risk learners and are likely to need special academic supports, such as tutoring or counseling, to function well in a regular school setting. Others, not well-suited to traditional classroom methods, may thrive in programs that emphasize hands-on learning in a non-classroom setting, computer-assisted learning, or another alternative educational approach. This may be especially true of students who are significantly over-age for their grade level or who have a history of difficulties in school.

Unfortunately, most communities have not developed as wide an array of supports and alternatives for school-age individuals as is needed. Programs for those beyond school-age generally are even more limited, and what does exist often is fully used, particularly with the increased demand resulting from literacy campaigns and the English language requirements of the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986. Filling these gaps will be critical, if those subject to FSA requirements are to be offered a real chance at academic success, rather than compelled to return to or stay in a situation which may be poorly suited to their individual needs, and which in the past may have meant only frustration and failure.

The education community is now grappling with the issue of how it can better serve the academic needs of a diverse range of learners. As answers and options are developed, FSA can help make the most of state and local commitments to adopt changes. For example, federal matching funds can be used to increase the wide diversity of education services that will keep at-risk JOBS participants moving

# SUCCESSFUL EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS FOR ADULTS AT RISK

Adult AFDC recipients who dropped out of school before graduation or who graduated without the skills necessary for employment come to education programs with quite diverse needs. Both the level at which they are functioning, as well as their ability to learn in traditional school settings, will differ. Most will have experienced the history of school failure and low self-esteem that are often associated with poor educational skills. Many individuals will have other problems that have interfered with their pursuit of learning. Because the individual needs and circumstances of AFDC recipients vary so widely, no one program model is likely to succeed with the entire population. There are, however, several principles that should guide the development of adult educational programs under the JOBS program.

- **Programs should be promoted in terms of growth, not deficiency.**

Many adults on AFDC have spent years trying to hide their insufficient skills in reading, writing, or computation. No matter what the actual conditions responsible for their limited educational competence, no matter what other skills they have learned over time, they see these deficiencies as proof of their own inadequacy. Second-chance educational programs need to help people regain their self-esteem and belief in their own ability to succeed. Successful adult education programs for AFDC recipients emphasize participants' growth, rather than deficiency. Instruction should be structured so that students can master the curricula in manageable chunks. Doing so will add to their self-confidence and enable them to build a history of success.

- **Programs should be responsive to diverse adult learning styles and needs.**

Adults learn best when what they are taught meets a specific and immediate need in their lives. A pragmatic, goal-oriented approach to teaching can effectively motivate adult AFDC students. As parents, they are motivated to learn so that they can read to their own children. As job-seekers, they are motivated when their lack of skills prevents them from attaining a job.

Adult learners are likely to encounter self-doubt and anxiety, especially at the beginning of the program. A peer support network and opportunities for counseling are often essential to ensure student entry and retention in a program.

The physical environment also plays an important role in helping adult learners succeed. Rather than holding classes in a traditional public school site, consideration should be given to holding classes in a more neutral place, e.g., a public library or community center. Similarly, instead of setting up classrooms with rows of individual desks all facing the teacher up front, it may be useful to use other classroom arrangements more conducive to group interaction and learner-

toward their particular educational objectives and, ultimately, toward self-sufficiency.

In addition to programs for school-age students, remedial education for adults, and courses in English as a Second Language (ESL), states may also support postsecondary education at community colleges, four-year colleges, or vocational-technical schools. Direct support may be provided to institutions to operate specific programs in which AFDC recipients are enrolled. Individual tuition assistance will be allowed to the extent that it is not available from other federal or state sources.

While FSA gives states broad latitude in how funds are used for education, there are some restrictions. Funds cannot be used to meet the normal costs of public education or to supplant state and local expenditures for existing programs; the restriction on supplantation also extends to non-federal postsecondary student aid sources. FSA further specifies that financial support for postsecondary education can be given *only* if the education is initiated as part of a JOBS employability plan. An AFDC recipient already enrolled in a program will be eligible for support services, like child care and transportation, but JOBS funds may not be used to pay for her/his education costs. (Regardless of how participants are placed in college, states may count them in determining the JOBS participation rate.)

Funds available through FSA must be used *only* to offset costs incurred by AFDC recipients. However, perhaps alert to the dangers of creating a two-tiered system – one for the poor and one for the rest – the Act does not require that programs supported by FSA funds be open only to JOBS participants. Costs in "mixed" programs are reimburseable, so long as accurate accounting is maintained.

Joint efforts between education and human

**"Joint efforts between education and human service officials to develop creative financing strategies for mixed programs . . . can ensure that AFDC recipients are not segregated from their peers, and that a broader segment of the at-risk population has access to new educational options."**

centered activity.

Adults who have been away from formal education for a long time and who are anxious about their ability to learn may get easily frustrated. Many adults – at least initially – tend to do better in a class or small group setting that meets at a set time and place than they do in a self-paced, completely self-structured learning environment. Having clear expectations about their attendance and performance, and regular and frequent interaction with instructors and instructional aides also helps to keep adult learners motivated and on target.

Low teacher to student ratios can promote success especially in programs for students at the low end of the skill continuum. When student/teacher ratios are high, computer-assisted instruction, self-directed learning centers, and peer tutors can be cost-effective complements to classroom instruction.

- **Learning experiences (especially the pace of learning) should be tailored to the needs of the individual.**

Increasingly, adult education and training programs across the country are modifying traditional course-based offerings by adopting elements of competency-based instruction and assessment. The primary characteristic of such programs is that the learning process begins not with a syllabus but with a set of very clear learning objectives and well-defined and demonstrable measures for determining whether the objectives have been met. Competency-based instructional systems are particularly appropriate for welfare training and placement programs since the instructional objectives can be closely related to the employment goals of the learners. Furthermore, they reinforce the necessary emphasis on growth, rather than deficiency, by focusing on *mastery* of necessary skills.

Renee Lerche, in her book, *Effective Adult Literacy Programs*, concludes that successful programs are those designed as total educational systems under which there is a balanced emphasis on: 1) clearly stated learning objectives, 2) assessment of learner needs and progress, 3) instructional process, 4) guidance and counseling, and 5) program management and evaluation. Specifically, she finds that successful programs:

- are clear about their overall goals and their philosophy of instruction;
- develop measurable goals for every component of the program (e.g., recruitment, orientation, counseling) so that they can monitor their success in meeting these goals;
- assist potential learners in determining if the program is well-suited to the learners' goals and expectations;
- are explicit and open with participants about intended learning outcomes for participants and standards for judging success in achieving outcomes;
- carefully diagnose each learner's educational needs and strengths and develop an individually-tailored learning plan for each participant;
- tie learning objectives to instructional methods and materials and to assessment strategies;
- provide continual feedback to learners about their progress and carefully document that progress;
- frequently evaluate their program's effectiveness in meeting its goals in each of the component areas, and use findings to improve their program.

service officials to develop creative financing strategies for mixed programs, while admittedly not an easy process, can ensure that AFDC recipients are not segregated from their peers, and that a broader segment of the at-risk population has access to new educational options. Possible funding sources to complement JOBS' state and local dollars include the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA), the Carl Perkins Vocational Education Act, the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, and Chapter 1 of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act, among others.

**"An 'employability plan' based on . . . individual assessment [makes] participants aware of the range of options available to them, their own goals and preferences can be taken into account, and they can receive guidance in making sound choices among the options."**

### OPPORTUNITY #3

**To make the right match between people, their needs, and the programs designed to help them.**

For a student at risk to succeed, whether a youngster or adult, it is important to identify and address the unique set of concerns she/he faces. Some of the concerns will be academic, others related to personal or family issues.

As we have stressed, FSA offers the opportunity to create greater capacity in educational programs and support services, so that when a need is identified, the resources will be there to respond. Just as important is a strategy to ensure that individuals receive the right mix of services and that all necessary supports are effectively coordinated.

FSA encourages states to develop mechanisms to do this by requiring an accurate assessment of every JOBS participant's prior work experience, skills, and potential employability, educational needs, and needed support services at the time they enter the program.

An "employability plan" based on that individual assessment is to be developed jointly by the participant and a staff person. Through the planning process, JOBS participants can be made aware of the range of options available to them, their own goals and preferences can be taken into account, and they can receive guidance in making sound choices among the options. In contrast to approaches that rely extensively or exclusively on sanctions, an effective assessment and planning process can help provide JOBS participants with incentives and the confidence to pursue positive goals they set for themselves.

Individualized planning in education is already used for students with disabilities under the federal Education for All Handicapped Children Act (P.L. 99-142), and has been recommended for other students at risk by the Council of Chief State School Officers. As yet, however, most schools systems have not undertaken this broader approach, often because of concern about potential costs in schools with a high concentration of students at risk. The Family Support Act can help to provide resources for individual assessment and planning for at least a portion of these students, as well as for many adults for whom in the past there has not been any source of support for planning related to educational services.

At a minimum, welfare agencies will need the advice and guidance of education officials to ensure that appropriate methods are used in determining literacy levels and educational needs. Alternatively, they may wish to have educational agencies perform directly some or all of the assessment and planning. Or approaches may vary by the type of recipient. For example, primary responsibility for assessment and plan development for adults might rest with a welfare agency case manager, while the schools could have a more central role with adolescent parents, for whom the education portion of the plan would be primary.

Whatever approach is selected, collaboration among agencies will enable the client and the staff person helping her/him to consider the entire range of individual needs and goals at one time and to develop an integrated plan that makes logical connections and transitions.

### OPPORTUNITY #4

**To reduce the future number of at-risk learners by developing innovative and more effective early intervention and prevention approaches.**

Public policymakers in both education and welfare strongly agree that the most desirable and least costly point to provide services is *early*, before serious problems develop. Nevertheless, these systems generally have special resources available to help children and families only after difficulties have developed.

The Family Support Act offers the opportunity to begin changing this situation in two ways. The individualized assessment, discussed

above, can consider not only the needs and goals of the individual JOBS participant, but family circumstances as well. It provides a good opportunity to explore with the parent what a child may need, including, for example, quality child care, tutoring or other interventions for school-age youngsters, and early childhood education programs for three- and four-year-olds. Close communication among staff in education, welfare, employment training, and other service systems, like housing, can ensure that the person conducting the assessment knows the right questions to ask, where referrals can be made, and how to secure services for family members as well as JOBS participants.

A second opportunity to increase early intervention and prevention is the FSA provision for *state and local demonstration projects*. In the area of education, the law authorizes demonstration projects to test:

- financial incentives and interdisciplinary approaches to reduce school dropout rates, encourage skill development, and avoid welfare dependency;
- non-academic approaches (e.g., counseling, services, recreation) to reduce rates of teen pregnancy, suicide, substance abuse, and school dropout among high-risk teens. (A "high-risk" teen is one defined as having a history of academic or behavioral problems, coming from a single-parent household, or being pregnant or a parent.) Although calling for "non-academic" approaches, these demonstrations must be linked to a local school system;
- early childhood development approaches to enhance the cognitive skills, linguistic ability, communications skills, and the ability to read, write, and speak English effectively among children under age five in AFDC households.

A total of $7.5 million has been authorized for these demonstrations but, unlike JOBS funding, monies have not yet been appropriated. The American Public Welfare Association and others have placed priority on securing appropriations for this purpose in the current session of Congress. If appropriations do become available, applications will be submitted to the Secretary of Health and Human Services according to procedures specified in the FSA regulations.

### OPPORTUNITY #5

**To begin to build a more comprehensive and effective system for *all* youth and adults at risk.**

Taken together, the opportunities outlined above can initiate changes to meet the educational needs of AFDC recipients in the short term and, over time, can provide the building blocks for a more effective education system for all state residents.

Although not enough by itself to transform educational systems, positive and successful action under the FSA can boost and lend focus to the dropout prevention and at-risk youth initiatives many states are already undertaking. More tangibly, this action can also expand educational programs, stimulate greater cooperation among agencies to meet the multiple needs of students, and supply the impetus for creative new approaches to better serve at-risk youth and adults.

**"Although not enough by itself to transform educational systems, positive and successful action under the FSA can boost and lend focus to the dropout prevention and at-risk youth initiatives many states are already undertaking."**

# PRINCIPLES TO GUIDE JOINT ACTION

States are starting from very different points as they approach implementation of the Family Support Act. Some already have in place a wide array of services that can support JOBS activities, while the resources of others are few or already stretched to capacity. Each state, therefore, will need to use the Act's opportunities to organize joint efforts in ways that best suit its particular situation. At the same time, if the potential of the Act is to be met, we believe that certain principles must guide action in every state.

**"High-level leadership can lower many of the potential barriers to collaboration, secure the commitment of the various agencies' staffs, and build public confidence."**

- **The visible commitment of top-level officials is a crucial first step.**

An endorsement of mutually agreed-upon goals by the Governor and the Governor's cabinet, especially the human service and employment/training commissioners, the chief state school officer, and the state board of education chairperson is essential. They must support an interagency process to demonstrate that the JOBS program transcends normal categorical and organizational boundaries. High-level leadership can lower many of the potential barriers to collaboration, secure the commitment of the various agencies' staffs, and build public confidence.

- **A strong interagency and intergovernmental planning process is key to effective collaboration.**

FSA is most likely to help families achieve self-sufficiency in state and local programs if there is interagency and intergovernmental cooperation that extends from the earliest stages of planning and priority-setting to the delivery of services. An effective planning process must actively involve state and local representatives of at least the education, welfare, social service, and employment

## NEXT STEPS

**The Family Support Act contains many challenges as well as important opportunities. Partnerships—especially the one between education and human services—will be a vital part of taking advantage of the potential before us. As you start down the long road of implementation, we urge that:**

**Welfare Administrators:**

- Contact your counterpart(s) in education and ask them to be part of the process
- Share materials and information on FSA with your counterparts; assist in understanding the law and regulations
- Familiarize yourself with your state's current education initiatives; if something isn't clear, ask about it—there's no such thing as a "dumb question"
- Assemble and share with your counterpart information on the demographics and characteristics of the AFDC population in your state
- Stay in contact with your national organizations to get information on issues that arise and to share your own experience

**Educators:**

- If you haven't yet been contacted, call your counterpart in welfare and express your interest in FSA
- Familiarize yourself with the Act's provisions; if something isn't clear, ask about it—there's no such thing as a "dumb question"
- Begin to assess your system's overall capacity to serve learners at risk; share information about your system's resources and initiatives for at-risk learners with your counterparts in public assistance
- Stay in contact with your national organizations to get information on issues that arise and to share your own experience

systems. Direct service staff, welfare recipients, and their advocates should also have input. This early communication will ensure that:

- everyone understands both FSA's strict requirements as well as its broad options;
- a wide range of expertise is used in framing the state's JOBS objectives and approaches;
- the structure, operating realities, and current priorities of each system are understood and accommodated; and
- the foundation is laid for mobilizing and linking the programs of various systems in the implementation phase.

Collaborative planning will also help to eliminate unnecessary duplication of services, avoid the repetition of mistaken strategies, and prevent the creation of new layers of discrete categorical programs. Further, an effective planning model developed at the state level can guide local communities in their own planning and implementation efforts.

- **Program priorities should be based on an accurate assessment of resources available in *all* key systems—welfare, education, social services, and employment and training—and of the variation in program availability and configuration throughout the state.**

Limited resources and the challenges of starting a new and very different kind of program will make incremental implementation desirable in most cases. Within federal guidelines, states will need to decide when and where in the state to begin JOBS activities, which groups of recipients to include, the types of services to offer, and how new resources can best be used. Ideally, these choices will be made jointly by the participating education and human service systems, and will reflect a cross-system view of current capacity, gaps to be filled, and the opportunities for greatest effectiveness in achieving joint goals.

Consultation with education personnel can insure that JOBS planners do not mistakenly assume that schools already have adequate resources for serving AFDC recipients. Recent state experiments with programs to link education and AFDC underscore the need for close communication, so that schools taking on new responsibilities receive commensurate assistance from the state. In a worst case scenario, schools might have to absorb some or all of the costs related to new reporting requirements; increased demand for teachers, counselors, supplies, and transportation; and the creation of program alternatives necessary to serve dropouts and at-risk students. Such a school might well be forced to choose between meeting these costs or simply not rendering crucial services.

With accurate assessment information at hand, however, a state might focus first on areas where there is a good combination of education programs and support services, well matched to client needs, and where there is an existing pattern or strong likelihood of local interagency cooperation. Or, a state might begin in an area where most but not quite all of the elements already are present, and where the addition of extra resources can complete the picture. Establishing comprehensive programs in rural areas and other locations where only a limited infrastructure currently exists will require more time to plan and put in motion.

**"Collaborative planning will also help to eliminate unnecessary duplication of services, avoid the repetition of mistaken strategies, and prevent the creation of new layers of discrete categorical programs."**

- **Implementation plans and schedules that recognize the inherent complexities of interagency collaboration will lessen subsequent problems.**

Interagency collaboration is not an easy process. Differences in training, professional orientation and vocabulary, competing pressures and priorities, restrictive laws and regulations, and the time and resources that the collaborative process itself takes all pose potential barriers. The situation is made harder because, even with the addition of the FSA's new resources, hard choices will have to be made. Yet, the reward in terms of improved outcomes for people and for the systems serving them will be well worth the investment of effort that is required. Moreover, a thoughtful process that understands and allows for the difficulties that will arise can help minimize their impact.

Each system will need to assess the impact JOBS will have on present operations. Will there be increased demand on current

resources, including programs, facilities, staff, and other components? Will JOBS change the demographics of their clientele? Will implementation bring changes in the time, place, and manner in which services are provided? Will staff need different skills and capabilities? Can inservice training provide those skills or must new staff be hired? The combined answers to these questions should frame the structure for initial implementation plans.

Differences in policies, procedures, and management structures among the various systems must also be accommodated. For example, any attempt to monitor school attendance by AFDC recipients will require welfare agencies to deal with a wide variety of practices

# AN ILLUSTRATION: FSA IN THE LIFE OF ONE FAMILY

Mary is 33 and the mother of two children – Jimmy, age 14, and Carla, age 16. Carla has a one year-old child. Both Carla and her baby live at home.

When the JOBS program began in their state, Mary and her family were receiving welfare, as they had for much of the past ten years. Mary's teenage daughter Carla, who had dropped out of school and become a mother herself, fell into a federally-established "target" category and was required to participate in the JOBS program. Mary was not in a target category, and did not have to enroll in this initial phase of JOBS, but she was hopeful about the prospects of the program, so she volunteered. Since the state welfare agency had decided to exercise its option to give priority status to *all* volunteers, even those not in a target group, Mary, too, was able to enroll in JOBS.

A counselor was assigned to work with them as their family's case manager throughout their participation in JOBS. He met individually with Mary and Carla, as well as with the two of them together, to talk about general family concerns that might affect their successful participation in the program.

In individual conferences, the counselor helped Mary and Carla examine their personal interests and goals and the difficulties that stood in the way of achieving them. Mary took a battery of tests that had been developed by the State Education Agency to provide additional information on her current skills; with Carla's permission, the counselor asked Carla's former school for similar information.

### Mary

Mary had always been frustrated at her inability to do well in school and dropped out at age 17. Soon after, she and her boyfriend decided to get married. Carla was born a year later and Jimmy, two years after that. It was a struggle financially, but they were managing until Mary's husband was killed, an innocent bystander caught in neighborhood violence. With two young children, no day care, and neither the education nor work experience needed to find a job that would pay the family's basic food and shelter costs, Mary felt forced to apply for AFDC.

Over the next ten years, Mary worked at several low-paying jobs, none of which paid health insurance or other benefits. One ended when her employer suddenly went out of business; she lost another when a subsequent employer reduced staff size. Family problems and transportation difficulties affected her performance on a third job.

Mary's basic academic skills were reasonably good and she had some work experience but she lacked both the high school diploma and specific training she needed to find a job that paid enough to support her family. The counselor suggested a new program at the community college that helped students prepare for the high school equivalency exam while training them as computer operators. Mary was very interested. The counselor spoke with the college to make sure that space was available and referred Mary under procedures established when the JOBS program began. The counselor also arranged for the transportation Mary would need to get to her program.

The welfare agency counselor stayed in touch with Mary, at first every other week and less frequently as she progressed. Mary appreciated his concern and encouragement and felt comfortable calling him with questions. She also relied on the college's own counseling program in which each JOBS participant was assigned to a faculty member who was available for guidance on academic matters or just to have a cup of coffee and talk.

in the way schools define, record, and report "absences" and "attendance;" for schools, the linkage of school attendance and income brings a very new perspective to the attendance monitoring they have traditionally done.

Anticipating these issues and spending the time in advance of implementation to develop processes that are equitable to clients and acceptable to the various institutions can minimize later disruption and discomfort for everyone. Further, recognizing that new directions are being set, often on the basis of imperfect information, continuing interagency and intergovernmental communication to monitor progress will ensure that program components are adjusted as needed.

**Carla**

Mary's daughter, Carla, had a long history of school problems. School records showed that she was reading at only a sixth-grade level and was often absent. After the birth of her baby, the absences became more frequent. The counselor suggested that an alternative program seemed the best way to help Carla deal with the combined demands of school and teen parenthood. Fortunately, space was available in a high-quality program whose capacity had been expanded with FSA funds.

In the alternative program, most of Carla's classes have no more than eight students, and extra help is available both from teachers and on-site tutors. The program is located on a regular high school campus, so Carla can participate in the school chorus. If she wants to, she can also take some other courses that are not offered within her alternative program. A counselor, who is paid by the welfare department but who works full-time at the school, runs a weekly discussion group for Carla and the other teen parents and keeps an "open door" for the young mothers to stop by if they need anything. The counselor—who helps with school, health, and social service problems—is seen by the girls as a friend, but also as someone who holds high expectations for them. An absence from school always brings a call, and there are few problems for which the counselor cannot help to find a solution.

Carla's baby is cared for in the new day care center which the school she attends opened recently; an amendment to state law permits her to bring the baby to school on the regular school bus. At lunch time, Carla and the other young mothers come to the center to feed and play with their children. The center director, trained in child development, uses the opportunity to observe the interactions between the mothers and their children and to talk with them about activities they can do with their children. Her suggestions are always made in a gentle, caring way, and most of the mothers readily turn to her for advice about their babies' health, nutrition, and general development. The director also visits each young woman at home at least twice during the year, as a way to make the link between what is learned in the center and caretaking at home.

**Jimmy**

During their first conversation, the case manager asked about how Mary's 14-year-old son Jimmy was doing. Mary reported that although he generally maintained a "C" average, math and English were giving him trouble this year. He had also gotten into his first fight at school. The counselor referred Mary to a volunteer tutoring program that could help Jimmy with difficult subjects, and told her about the local Boys Club where Jimmy could find supervised recreational programs, friends, and caring adults to spend time with. The counselor also encouraged Mary to contact him if there were more incidents at school. Further, with Mary's permission, he arranged for a regular school counselor to keep an eye on Jimmy and let him know if more serious problems developed. In subsequent conversations with Mary, the JOBS counselor made a point of asking about Jimmy periodically.

Neither Mary nor Carla will leave AFDC immediately, but supported by necessary services, they are gaining the self-confidence and skills they will need for financial independence. And, with early action to prevent small problems from becoming big ones, Jimmy is staying on track in school.

This Statement is itself an example of the kind of close professional cooperation and collaboration which we hope will emerge in the wake of the Family Support Act. The following persons, affiliated with 11 organizations, participated in various ways to conceive, write, edit, critique, and produce the statement: Martin J. Blank, Cynthia G. Brown, Peter E. Carlson, Michael Cohen, Jacqueline P. Danzberger, Lynne Fender, Evelyn Ganzglass, Mark Greenberg, Samuel Halperin, Alan W. Houseman, Tom Joe, Clifford M. Johnson, Janet E. Levy, David Long, Atelia Melaville, Glenda Partee, Cheryl Rogers, Arloc Sherman, Bard Shollenberger, and Beverly Yanich. Funding from the Ford Foundation, the Foundation for Child Development, and Youth and America's Future: The William T. Grant Foundation Commission on Work, Family and Citizenship made it possible to publish and disseminate this document.

# APPENDIX A

## Summary of the Major Provisions of the Family Support Act

The Family Support Act of 1988 (FSA) requires for the first time that welfare agencies make available educational services as a component of the new Job Opportunities and Basic Skills Program (JOBS).

**Whom Will States Serve?** States have many options, but *must* establish educational services for at least some members of the following two groups:

- Custodial parents under age 20 who have not completed high school or its equivalent. States may exempt younger teen parents under age 18 from participation requirements, subject to regulations to be issued by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) by October 13, 1989.[1]
- Parents age 20 or older who have not completed high school or its equivalent, to the extent that the state has decided to require such parents to participate in JOBS. This simply means that states that choose to run a mandatory work or training program for older dropout parents must provide them with a basic education first. Members of this group may be enrolled concurrently in other JOBS activities, but those must not interfere with their education.

The statutory requirements are not rigid. States only have to enroll as many members of the above groups as their resources permit. FSA leaves states much leeway in targeting services toward particular groups and in deciding that educational or other services are not feasible in particular localities. However, HHS regulations could constrain state flexibility, particularly a state's ability to limit the geographic scope of its JOBS program.[2]

Beyond these requirements, states are given the opportunity to serve high school graduates who wish to enroll, or have already enrolled, in post-secondary education or training. This could include enrollment in community colleges, vocational-technical schools, community-based institutions, and four-year colleges. Further, states may provide remedial education or skills training to parents who have a high school diploma but still lack basic skills. And states may require children ages 16 or over in AFDC families to participate in education or other JOBS activities if they are not currently attending an academic or vocational school full time.

**Federally-Specified Target Groups.** *FSA establishes specific target groups to which states must give priority.* These are:

- parents under 24 who have not completed high school and are not enrolled in high school or its equivalent;
- long-term recipients, i.e., those who have received AFDC for at least 36 months during the last five years;
- parents under 24 with little or no recent work experience;
- members of a family in which the youngest child is within two years of being ineligible for AFDC because of age, i.e., age 16 in a state that ends AFDC eligibility at age 18.

A state could lose a portion of the federal matching funds for its AFDC program unless it expends at least 55 percent of its JOBS funds on these target groups. Within the target groups, states must give priority to those who volunteer to participate.

**What Services Must States Offer?** The FSA mandates that states make available a broad range of educational and work-related services. The educational services must include high school or equivalent education (combined with job training as needed), basic and remedial education to achieve a basic literacy level, and education for individuals with limited English proficiency.

States may add college and other educational services to this list. Each state can decide precisely what kind of educational activities it will offer, whether they will be available statewide or only in certain areas, how such educational activities will be provided, and when they will begin.

**Will Participants Volunteer or Will They Be Required to Participate?** This decision is largely up to the state. States may choose to require that various groups of AFDC recipients

[1] The Department issued *draft* regulations for public comment in April of 1989. The draft regulations make it relatively difficult for states to exempt parents under 18. They permit a state to exempt a custodial parent under 18 from the requirements only if: the parent is beyond the state's compulsory attendance laws, and if the state's JOBS plan contains criteria which (a) provide for individualized rather than categorical exemptions; (b) do not rely solely on grade completion; and (c) provide for participation in another educational activity from which the individual could benefit. In accompanying comments, HHS explains that excusing custodial parents from high school attendance should be "rare," and that, in such instances, the state must provide for assignment to available educational alternatives.

[2] The draft regulations, for example, would require states to establish a statewide JOBS program by October of 1992 in all major urban (Metropolitan Statistical) areas and enough other areas to serve 75 percent of the adult AFDC population; in addition, states would have to establish a more minimal program (offering at least job search, high school education, and one of four optional components to be chosen by the state) in areas sufficient to serve 95 percent of its AFDC adults, to be considered a statewide program. If this guideline is not met, states would be required to justify why their program is not available statewide.

participate in the JOBS program, including most parents with children over age three (or over age one at state option). Further, FSA indicates that states must require young AFDC parents, ages 18 or 19, to participate in an educational activity if they have not finished high school, regardless of the age of their child. The law, however, modifies this mandate to say that states must serve volunteers first within the federally designated "target groups" noted above, which encompass all dropout parents under age 24, including those ages 18 and 19. Moreover, states cannot require participation unless child care is available.

Indeed, the Act includes enough other exemptions and qualifications that a state can legitimately run a "volunteers first" program for all persons within or outside the target groups. The only restrictions are that 55 percent of its resources must go to serving members of the target groups, and that federal participation quotas must be met. However, most persons who enroll voluntarily in the JOBS program will still be subject to penalties, in the form of benefit reductions, if they later drop out of the program without "good cause." (See section on **Sanctions** below.)

**Other JOBS Activities.** Besides education, JOBS services must include job skills training, job development, and placement and readiness activities, plus at least two of the following: job search, on-the-job training, work supplementation, or community work experience.

**Assessment and Orientation.** To determine what education services will be provided to participants under the FSA, state agencies must assess the educational needs and child care and other supportive service needs of each non-exempt family member or voluntary participant. Based on this assessment, an employability plan will be developed for each participant that will set forth the activities in which the participant will take part, including education programs, child care, and other supportive services. The state *may* require the participant to negotiate and enter into a contract specifying the obligations of both participant and agency, including the activities to be conducted and services to be provided. The state *may* also assign a case manager to the participant and participant's family to obtain or broker services for the family, monitor progress, and review the employability plan.

**Child Care.** FSA requires states to guarantee child care to participants who need it whenever a JOBS participant is satisfactorily participating in an approved educational activity. The state must also provide transportation and other support services that it determines to be necessary to participation.[3]

States can assure child care by providing the care directly, arranging care through providers, providing cash or vouchers in advance to the custodial parent, reimbursing the custodial parent, arranging with other agencies and community volunteer groups for nonreimbursed care, or adopting other methods the state agency deems appropriate. States must pay at least the lesser of the actual cost of child care or the dollar amount of the AFDC "child care disregard," i.e., $175 per month for a child over age two or $200 for a child under two. The state may pay a greater amount for child care so long as it does not exceed the local market rate.

**Transitional Benefits.** FSA requires states, by April 1, 1990, to offer child care and medical benefits to persons losing AFDC due to employment. Former recipients will be entitled to up to one year of child care if the state determines the care to be necessary for employment, and if the recipient loses AFDC eligibility due to increased hours of employment, wages from employment, or loss of AFDC earnings disregards. Beneficiaries of this care must have received AFDC for at least three of the six months prior to the loss of eligibility, contribute to the cost of care on a sliding scale established by the state, and meet certain other requirements.

Former recipients will also be entitled to continued medical assistance for up to one year. Generally, states must provide the first six months of coverage without a fee. After that, states must offer an additional six months of coverage to families with income below 185 percent of the federal poverty threshold, but may impose a premium for families with earnings over the poverty level.

**Sanctions.** States must sanction persons who fail without "good cause" to participate in the JOBS program, unless they fall within one of the federally-exempt categories (e.g., ill or disabled) in FSA. Non-exempt persons in the JOBS program may be sanctioned even if they enrolled as volunteers, i.e., without the state specifically requiring them to participate. Exempt persons are not sanctioned, but exempt persons who drop out of the

[2]Draft HHS regulations track the language of the FSA but accompanying comments by the Department raise questions about the extent of the state duty to provide child care.

[4]Draft federal regulations do not add to this exemption from program participation. The FSA itself includes further good cause reasons for a participant not accepting employment. The law specifies that participants shall not be sanctioned for failing to accept a job offer that would result in a net loss of pay, nor for refusing to take a job for more than 20 hours per week if she is the caretaker to a child under 6.

[5]It is not yet clear what educational activities will be included within this state maintenance of effort requirement. Draft regulations are ambiguous in their treatment of programs serving both AFDC and non-AFDC participants.

JOBS program without good cause after having commenced participation will be denied priority so long as other individuals are actively seeking to participate. The definition of "good cause" governing participation is left mostly to the states. The FSA does provide that no sanction can be imposed on a parent who refuses to participate in an education program due to a lack of child care.[4] Each state must establish a conciliation procedure for resolving disputes about program participation, and for a hearing with respect to the dispute if it is not resolved through conciliation.

**Funding.** Additional federal funds are made available to match state expenditures for JOBS programs, including educational activities, under a capped entitlement formula. The central provision of this formula provides a federal match of at least 60 percent for the bulk of a state's program, up to a maximum amount based on the state's relative number of adult AFDC recipients. The capped federal funds begin with $600 million in FY (fiscal year) 1989, rising to $1.3 billion by FY 1995.

State welfare expenditures for administrative costs, costs of transportation, and other work-related supportive services are matched at 50 percent and are also subject to the cap. Child care costs are matched at the state's Medicaid rate, with no cap on these expenditures.

Federal funds for educational activities under JOBS may not be used to supplant non-federal funds for existing services and activities which promote the purpose of the JOBS program. State and local expenditures for such activities must be maintained at least at the level of such expenditures for FY 1986.[5]

**Participation Quotas.** Unless a state satisfies federal participation quotas, federal matching funds for the state AFDC program will be reduced to 50 percent, from the higher rate of 60 percent or more. The quotas follow a specific schedule: seven percent in FY 1990, 11 percent in FY 1992 and FY 1993, 15 percent in FY 1994, and 20 percent in FY 1995.

FSA leaves it to the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) to define "participation" but provides that it must involve more than mere registration, i.e., actual participation in some component of the JOBS program.[6] In certain cases, the Secretary of HHS may waive the fiscal penalties against a state that has not met its quota.

**Planning.** Planning for the JOBS program is likely to begin immediately and in many states is well under way. Planning is made difficult by the lack of final federal regulations, however. HHS published proposed regulations on April 18 and final regulations are due by October 13, 1989. Some states may need to enact new legislation that will likely be considered during the legislative session beginning in 1989. Most states will likely need additional appropriations either this year or next.

States must have a JOBS program in place, including educational activities, by October 1, 1990. Initially, the program may operate in only a portion of the state. States must have the program available in each portion of the state where it is feasible to do so by October 1, 1992. States could implement much earlier if they complete the changes required in their state AFDC plan: a number of states plan to implement their programs by July 1, 1989, the earliest allowable date.

**Demographic Study.** States may conduct a preliminary demographic study of potential JOBS participants, funded with a 50 percent federal match. The study would analyze the educational attainment and skill deficits of potential participants, the capacity of existing institutions to meet their educational needs, and any changes or additions needed in the service delivery system.

Every state must use the services of local Private Industry Councils to make estimates of the types of jobs available or likely to become available in the service delivery areas.

**State Plan.** A state cannot begin receiving federal JOBS funds until it submits a JOBS and Supportive Services plan that is approved by HHS. In developing these state plans, the welfare agency must consult with the education agency as well as the agency responsible for administering job training programs in the state. This plan must estimate the number of persons to be served in educational activities; a description of the services to be provided and the educational and skill needs to be addressed; the extent to which the services are expected to be made available by state and local educational agencies, community-based organizations, and other agencies; and the extent to which such educational services are to be provided or funded by the JOBS program. The state plan must be published and made reasonably available to the general public through local news facilities and public announcements.

**Child Support Provisions.** Besides creating the JOBS program, the FSA also makes important changes in child support enforcement, designed to improve the identification of absent parents – particularly but not solely parents of children in AFDC and other low income families – and the collection of child support payments from them.

FSA toughens requirements, imposed by Congress in 1975 and 1984 as a condition of participating in the AFDC program, that states have a statewide child support enforcement program to help locate absent parents, establish paternity, obtain and enforce support orders. By October of 1989, for example, courts and other

---

[6]HHS has proposed to define participation in most cases as receiving AFDC and taking part in at least one of the state's designated JOBS components (other than orientation, assessment, case management or employability development) for a monthly average of at least 20 hours per week. The primary exception is that, for educational activities, no hourly minimum is imposed but the participant must be making satisfactory progress by the standards of the educational provider.

decision makers must use the state's child support guidelines in establishing or modifying support awards unless doing so would be unjust or unreasonable. (Federal officials estimate this provision will triple the size of the average child support award.) These state guidelines must be updated at least once every four years.

Further, all new support orders must provide for automatic collection through immediate wage withholding unless both parties agree to an alternate arrangement or there is a finding of good cause for not ordering it. If the case is being handled by the state's "Title IV-D" child support enforcement system (which encompasses all AFDC cases), this provision takes effect in November of 1990 and covers modifications as well as new orders; in all other child support cases the provision takes effect in January of 1994.

By November of 1989, all parties to a contested paternity action must submit to genetic testing. By November of 1990, parents must furnish their Social Security number to the state's birth records agency as part of the process involved in the issuance of a birth certificate.

While these provisions potentially affect all families with an absent parent, other provisions of the FSA apply only to AFDC recipients. Effective January 1989, for example, the FSA clarifies that states must give custodial parents on AFDC at least $50 per month of the total amount collected by the state from an absent father. (States may keep the remainder to defray costs of providing AFDC.) Effective October, 1989, the law extends for an additional year a federal provision giving Medicaid coverage for four months to families leaving the AFDC program due to increased income from child support. Lastly, effective January 1993, FSA requires states to send AFDC families monthly notices of the amount of support collected from an absent parent.

Benefits for Unemployed Two-Parent Families. Currently, about half of all states operate an AFDC-UP (unemployed parent) program, which provides benefits to two-parent families whose income is limited due to a parent's unemployment. The FSA requires the remaining states to establish at least a limited AFDC-UP program by October 1, 1990.

Specifically, a state which did not have an AFDC-UP program on September 26, 1988, may limit the number of months of AFDC-UP eligibility to no less than six months in any 12 month period. If a state imposes time limits on benefits, it still must provide Medicaid coverage to family members who would be receiving benefits but for the time limits.

States may, except as otherwise provided by other provisions of the JOBS program, require AFDC-UP parents to participate in JOBS up to 40 hours per week.

Changes in Disregards. Under present law, a certain amount of earned income is disregarded in calculating AFDC benefit levels as an incentive for working. As of October 1 of 1989, the standard monthly earned income disregard goes up from $75 to $90.

On the same date, the child care disregard goes up from $160 per child to $175 per child two years and older, and to $200 per child under age two. The child care disregard is to be applied as the last step in AFDC budgeting. Further, the earned income tax credit must be completely disregarded for AFDC purposes.

Option to Require Minor Parents to Live at Home. Effective January 1, 1990, states may choose to require a parent or pregnant woman under 18 who has never married to live in a specified setting to get AFDC. If the state takes this option, the AFDC benefits, where possible, will be paid to the adult relative instead of the minor parent.

The minor parent would have to live in either the home of her parent, guardian or adult relative, or in a foster home, maternity home or other adult-supervised supportive living arrangement. The requirement would apply *unless* (a) there was no living parent or guardian whose whereabouts were known; (b) the parent or guardian would not let the minor parent live in the home; (c) the emotional or physical health or safety of the minor parent or her child would be jeopardized by living in the home; (d) the minor parent had lived apart from her parent or guardian for at least a year before having a child or applying for AFDC; or (e) the state found "good cause," in accordance with HHS regulations.

Pre-eligibility Fraud Detection. By October 1, 1989, states are required to provide for appropriate measures to detect fraudulent applications for AFDC before eligibility is established.

Demonstration Projects. FSA authorizes numerous possible state demonstration projects. Most of these experimental projects will require federal funds to operate effectively. FSA authorizes, but Congress has not yet appropriated, the funds for projects such as the following:

1) **Demonstration Projects to Test the Effect of Early Childhood Development Programs.** Up to ten states may devise such development programs to enhance the cognitive skills and linguistic abilities of children under five, to improve the communication skills of such children, and to develop their ability to read, write, and speak English effectively.

2) **Demonstration Projects to Encourage Innovative Education and Training Programs for Children.** Any state may conduct a project to test financial incentives and interdisciplinary approaches to reducing school dropouts, encouraging skill development and avoiding welfare dependency.

3) **Demonstrations to Ensure Long-Term Family Self-Sufficiency through Community-Based Services.** Any state may test more effective methods of providing coordination and services for comprehensive family support services.

4) **Demonstration Projects to Provide Counseling and Services to High Risk Teenagers.** Four states may devise projects to provide a Teen Care plan, including a clearinghouse, and other services, for teenagers with a history of academic or behavioral problems, or who come from one-parent families, who are parents, or pregnant.

Benefit Levels. The FSA does not require states to raise benefits nor does it create a national minimum benefit level. However, each state must reevaluate its standard of need and payment level at least once every three years, and report this information to the federal government and the public under a schedule set by HHS. The report must include a statement of how the need standard is determined, the relationship between the need standard and payment standard, and any changes in these standards during the past three years. The Act also requires studies of alternative minimum benefit approaches.

# APPENDIX B

## An Overview of AFDC – The Aid to Families With Dependent Children Program

Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) is the basic cash welfare program for families with children. To be eligible, a family must contain at least one child under age 18 or, in certain circumstances, under 19. The family must be deprived of parental support or care due to the death, absence, or incapacity of a parent. Some states have also permitted two-parent families to receive AFDC in limited situations after a working parent has lost employment (the AFDC-Unemployed Parent Program). Under the Family Support Act, all states will be required to extend benefits for at least part of each year to these two-parent families. (The average AFDC family in 1987 contained three people.)

The federal government pays about 54 percent of the cost of AFDC payments to eligible families. Each state is free to set the level of assistance to families in the state. In 1988, the typical (median) state payment for a family of three with *no* other income was $359 per month, or $4,308 per year. This amount was less than half the federal poverty line for a family of three. Most families receiving AFDC also receive Food Stamps, which cover part, but not all, of monthly food costs. They are also eligible for Medicaid coverage.

If a parent receives any *unearned* income, the amount of this income is subtracted from the family grant. A parent who works is permitted to keep an amount of *earnings* equal to certain work expenses; above this, most of her earnings will also result in a dollar-for-dollar reduction in benefits.

Federal law imposes resource limits on AFDC families. A family is ineligible for aid if its countable assets exceed $1,000 (or a lower limit if set by the state). Countable assets include cash and liquid resources. Resource guidelines often make it hard for a family to establish AFDC eligibility if the family owns a car.

The Family Support Act does not change benefit levels or asset/resource limitations. It does provide that many families leaving the rolls after participation in JOBS will be eligible for transitional health care and child care subsidies.

Since 1967, there have been requirements in the AFDC law that most recipients with children over age six participate in state employment and training programs as a condition of receiving AFDC. The primary program for this purpose was the Work Incentive (WIN) program. Because of limited and, in fact, declining federal financing, however, relatively few AFDC recipients received substantial help in securing employment through WIN in recent years. The Family Support Act will change this by providing new federal money for states to expand or re-establish employment and training programs for more of their AFDC populations.

# APPENDIX C

## Resources for Additional Information and Assistance

**American Public Welfare Association (APWA)**

Beverly Yanich, Associate Director
Bard Shollenberger, Senior Policy Associate
810 First Street N.E.
Suite 500
Washington, DC 20002
(202) 682-0100

APWA represents state and local human service departments and individual members. It advocates sound, effective, and compassionate social welfare policy and brings state and local policy leadership into national decision-making. APWA carries out a comprehensive agenda of social welfare policy research, development, and analysis, and provides information and technical assistance to state and local officials and others on all aspects of the Family Support Act of 1988.

**Center for Law and Social Policy (CLASP)**

Alan W. Houseman, Executive Director
Mark Greenberg, Senior Staff Attorney
Arloc Sherman, Research Associate
1616 P Street N.W.
Suite 350
Washington, DC 20036
(202) 328-5140

CLASP works to establish effective linkages between U.S. welfare and education systems to help address the problems of poverty in America's poor families. The Center provides information and technical assistance to state and federal officials, school personnel, and legal and policy advocates in meeting the requirements of the Family Support Act of 1988.

**Center for the Study of Social Policy (CSSP)**

Tom Joe, Director
Cheryl Rogers, Senior Research Associate
1250 Eye Street N.W.
Suite 503
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 371-1565

The Center provides information on the principles of interagency and intergovernmental planning, budgeting, and service delivery.

**Children's Defense Fund (CDF)**

Clifford M. Johnson, Acting Director, Division of Family Supports
122 C Street N.W.
Washington, DC 20001
(202) 628-8787

CDF, a private, non-profit organization, gathers data, publishes reports, and provides information on key issues affecting children. It also monitors the development and implementation of federal and state policies, provides technical assistance and support to a network of state and local child advocates, organizations, and public officials, pursues an annual legislative agenda, and litigates selected major cases.

**Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO)**

Cynthia G. Brown, Director, Resource Center on Educational Equity
Glenda Partee, Assistant Director
400 North Capitol Street
Washington, DC 20001
(202) 393-8159

CCSSO is a non-profit organization composed of the heads of the 57 departments of public education in every state, the District of Columbia, the Department of Defense Dependent Schools, and five extra-state jurisdictions. The CCSSO Resource Center on Educational Equity is responsible for implementing various CCSSO leadership initiatives to provide better educational services to children and youth at risk of school failure. It provides technical assistance in policy formulation, develops programs and materials, holds conferences, monitors civil rights issues, and provides training. The Center also publishes a quarterly newsletter.

**Institute for Educational Leadership (IEL)**

Jacqueline P. Danzberger, Director of Local Improvement Programs
Martin J. Blank, Senior Associate
1001 Connecticut Avenue N.W.
Suite 310
Washington, DC 20036
(202) 822-8405

The Institute for Educational Leadership (IEL) is a non-profit organization dedicated to collaborative problem-solving strategies for education. The Institute's programs focus on leadership development, demographic analyses, business-education partnerships, school restructuring, and programs concerning at-risk youth.

**Joining Forces**

Janet E. Levy, Director
400 North Capitol Street
Suite 379
Washington, DC 20001
(202) 393-8159

Joining Forces promotes collaboration between education and social welfare agencies on behalf of children and families at risk. Information is available on strategies and programs for successful collaboration.

**Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation (MDRC)**

David Long, Senior Research Associate
Three Park Avenue
New York, NY 10016
(212) 532-3200

MDRC, an independent non-profit organization, designs, manages, and evaluates programs intended to increase the self-sufficiency of disadvantaged groups. Its studies of programs for welfare recipients, teen parents, and dropout youth have provided information about the implementation and effectiveness of different program approaches across a range of conditions.

**National Alliance of Business (NAB)**

Peter E. Carlson, Director, Economic and Policy Analysis
Steven Golightly, Director, Training and Consulting Services
1201 New York Avenue N.W.
Suite 700
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 289-2888

The Alliance works with the business community to promote and inform employer involvement in planning, marketing, and hiring from effective welfare-to-work efforts.

**National Association of State Boards of Education (NASBE)**

Janice Earle, Program Director, Youth Services
1012 Cameron Street
Alexandria, VA 22314
(703) 684-4000

NASBE provides information on: educational policy-setting at the state level; successful programs for youth at risk, especially adolescent parents; and early childhood programs. Publications on these subjects are available.

**National Governors' Association (NGA)**

Michael Cohen, Program Director, Education Program
Lynne Fender, Program Director, Social Services Program
Evelyn Ganzglass, Program Director, Training and Employment Program
400 North Capitol Street
Suite 250
Washington, DC 20001
(202) 624-5300

NGA, representing the Governors of the 50 states and the territories, seeks to influence the shape and implementation of national policy and to apply creative leadership to the solution of state problems. NGA provides assistance to Governors and their staffs in the areas of education, social services, employment/training, and health policy through research, publications, conferences, and consultation.

**Public/Private Ventures (P/PV)**

Michael A. Bailin, President
Gary C. Walker, Vice President
399 Market Street
Philadelphia, PA 19106
(215) 592-9099

P/PV, a non-profit corporation focused on economic development and training issues, develops and manages demonstration projects, conducts research and policy analysis, provides technical assistance to organizations and businesses, and performs program assessments and evaluations.

# APPENDIX D
## For Further Reading

The following recent publications provide useful information about education, training for employment, and the poor.

**Education, Training and Economic Opportunity**

Gordon Berlin and Andrew Sum, *Toward a More Perfect Union: Basic Skills, Poor Families, and Our Economic Future*. New York: Ford Foundation, 1988.

Committee for Economic Development, *Children in Need: Investment Strategies for the Educationally Disadvantaged*. New York: 1987.

William T. Grant Foundation Commission on Work, Family and Citizenship, *The Forgotten Half: Non-College Youth in America*. Washington, DC: 1988.

William T. Grant Foundation Commission on Work, Family and Citizenship, *The Forgotten Half: Pathways to Success for America's Youth and Young Families*. Washington, DC: 1988.

S.M. Miller, et al., *Too Late to Patch: Reconsidering Second-Chance Opportunities for Hispanic and Other Dropouts*. Washington, DC: Hispanic Policy Development Project, 1988.

Public/Private Ventures, *A Practitioner's Guide: Strategies, Programs, and Resources for Youth Employability Development*. Philadelphia, PA: revised 1988.

(Additional valuable resources may be found in *Public Welfare*, a publication of the American Public Welfare Association.)

**School Reform for All Students**

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, *An Imperiled Generation: Saving Urban Schools*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1988.

Thomas Corcoran, Lisa Walker and Lynne White, *Working in Urban Schools*. Washington, DC: Institute for Educational Leadership, 1988.

John I. Goodlad, *A Place Called School: Prospects for the Future*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1984.

National Association of State Boards of Education, *Educational Accountability: Improving Schools, Informing the Public*. Alexandria, VA: 1988.

National Association of State Boards of Education, *Rethinking Curriculum: A Call for Fundamental Reform*. Alexandria, VA: 1988.

National Association of State Boards of Education, *Right from the Start*. Alexandria, VA: 1988.

Theodore R. Sizer, *Horace's Compromise: The Dilemma of the American High School*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin, 1984.

**Students At Risk**

Center for Human Resources, Heller Graduate School, Brandeis University, "Case Management with At-Risk Youth." *Youth Programs*. Fall 1988.

Children's Defense Fund, *The Lessons of Multi-Site Initiatives Serving High-Risk Youths*. Washington, DC: 1989.

Council of Chief State School Officers, *Elements of a Model State Statute to Provide Educational Entitlements for At-Risk Students*. Washington, DC: 1988.

Council of Chief State School Officers, *School Success for Students At Risk: Analysis and Recommendations of the Council of Chief State School Officers*. Orlando, FL: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, 1988.

Andrew Hahn and Jacqueline Danzberger, *Dropouts in America: Enough is Known for Action*. Washington, DC: Institute for Educational Leadership, 1987.

MDC, Inc., *America's Shame, America's Hope: Twelve Million Youth At Risk*. Chapel Hill, NC: 1988.

National Association of State Boards of Education, *What's Promising: New Approaches to Dropout Prevention for Girls*. Alexandria, VA: 1987.

Margaret Terry Orr, *Keeping Students in School*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 1987.

**Comprehensive Services**

American Public Welfare Association and National Council of State Human Service Administrators, *One Child in Four*. Washington, DC: 1986.

Annie E. Casey Foundation, *A Strategic Planning Guide for the New Futures Initiative*. Greenwich, CT: 1988.

Sar A. Levitan, Garth L. Mangum, and Marion W. Pines. *A Proper Inheritance: Investing in the Self-Sufficiency of Poor Families*. Washington, DC: Center for Social Policy Studies, The George Washington University, June 1989.

Denise F. Polit, et al., *The Challenge of Serving Teenage Mothers: Lessons from Project Redirection*. New York: Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation, 1988.

National Association of State Boards of Education, *Joining Forces: A Report from the First Year*. Alexandria, VA: 1989.

Jolie Bain Pillsbury, "Changing the System from Within: Reform at the State Level." *Public Welfare* (Spring 1989).

Public/Private Ventures, *Summer Training and Education Program (STEP): Report on the 1986 Experience*. Philadelphia, PA: 1987.

Lisbeth B. Schorr, *Within Our Reach: Breaking the Cycle of Disadvantage*. New York: Doubleday, 1988.

**Ensuring Family Involvement**

James P. Comer, "Educating Poor Minority Children." *Scientific American*, Vol. 259, No. 5 (November 1988).

Council of Chief State School Officers, "Early Childhood and Family Education: Foundations for Success." Washington, DC: 1988.

Council of Chief State School Officers, *A Guide for State Action: Early Childhood and Family Education*. Washington, DC: 1988.

National School Boards Association, *First Teachers: Parental Involvement in the Public Schools*. Washington, DC: 1988.

**School/Business Partnerships**

Center for Human Resources, Heller Graduate School, Brandeis University, *A Guide to Working Partnerships*. Waltham, MA: 1988.

Margaret Hunt and Daniel W. Merenda, *Creating & Managing a Corporate School Volunteer Program*. Alexandria, VA: National Association of Partners in Education, 1983.

Marsha Levine and Roberta Trachtman, eds., *American Business in the Public Schools: Case Studies of Corporate Involvement in Public Education*. New York: Teachers College Press, 1988.

Daniel W. Merenda, *A Practical Guide to Creating & Managing School/Community Partnerships*. Alexandria, VA: National Association of Partners in Education, 1986.

Daniel W. Merenda, *How to Organize and Manage School Volunteer Programs*. Alexandria, VA: National Association of Partners in Education, 1987.

Public/Private Ventures, *Allies in Education: Schools and Businesses Working Together for At-Risk Youth, Vol. I: Findings from the National Assessment*. Philadelphia: 1987.

**Adult Basic Education**

Association for Community Based Education, *Adult Literacy: A Study of Community Based Literacy Programs*. Washington, DC: revised 1986.

Arelene Fingeret, *Adult Literacy Education: Current and Future Directions*. Columbus, OH: National Center for Research in Vocational Education, 1984.

Renee S. Lerche, *Effective Adult Literacy Programs: A Practitioner's Guide*. New York, NY: Cambridge Book Co., 1985.

U.S. Department of Labor and U.S. Department of Education, *The Bottom Line: Basic Skills in the Workplace*. Washington, DC: 1988.

**Welfare Recipients and College**

Chancellor's Office, California Community Colleges, *GAIN Survey/Study: Summary Report*. Sacramento, California: 1988.

Douglas M. North, "AFDC Goes to College." *Public Welfare* (Fall 1987).

Dale Parnell, *The Neglected Majority*. Washington, DC: Community College Press, 1985.

The Washington Office of the College Board, *College Opportunity and Public Assistance Programs: Ideas for Resolving Conflicts*. Washington, DC: College Entrance Examination Board, 1984.

**Demographics of Poverty and Education**

Center for Law and Social Policy, *Poverty Picture*. A series of fact sheets. Washington, DC: 1988.

Clifford M. Johnson, Andrew M. Sum, and James D. Weill, *Vanishing Dreams: The Growing Economic Plight of America's Young Families*. Washington, DC: Children's Defense Fund, 1988.

Harold L. Hodgkinson, *All One System: Demographics of Education, Kindergarten Through School*. Washington, DC: Institute for Educational Leadership, 1985.

Harold L. Hodgkinson, *Demographic Analyses of Individual States and Their Educational Systems*. (Reports available on Arizona, Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Michigan, Minnesota, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Texas, and Wyoming.) Washington, DC: Institute for Educational Leadership.

U.S. Bureau of the Census, Current Population Reports, Series P-70 No. 11, *What's It Worth? Educational Background and Economic Status: Spring 1984*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1987.

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Family Support Administration, *Characteristics and Financial Circumstances of AFDC Recipients, 1986*. Washington, DC: n.d.

**Family Support Act**

Josie Foehrenbach, *Preparing for Learnfare: Setting the Conditions for a Questionable Experiment*. Washington, DC: Center for Law and Social Policy, 1988.

Mark Greenberg, *JOBS Provisions of the Family Support Act of 1988: Ten Early Choices*. Washington, DC: Center for Law and Social Policy, 1988.

Mark Greenberg, *Family Support Act of 1988: JOBS Program and Related Amendments: Requirements, Issues and Options*. Washington, DC: Center for Law and Social Policy, 1988.

Alan W. Houseman and Arloc Sherman, *Welfare Reform and the Education Provisions: Programmatic Options and Recommendations*. Washington, DC: Center for Law and Social Policy, 1989.

Bard Shollenberger, "Family Support Act of 1988." *W-Memo*. Memorandum W-12-14 (November 1988).

Bard Shollenberger, "Highlights of Proposed Regulations to Implement the Family Support Act." *W-Memo*. (June 1989).